

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 1-6 are amended in a manner that is not believed to be narrowing, and new claims 7-14 are added. Further, the reasons for the amendment are not narrowing in view of any requirement or reason for patentability. In view of at least the following remarks, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections and rejections, and allowance of the claims.

I. Objections

The Examiner objects to the drawings due to alleged lack of disclosure with respect to claims 1 and 5, and requests either corrected drawings or amended claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's objection, because the claimed relationship is one that is clearly disclosed in the written description at pages 7-9 of the application specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that because it represents a relationship between already-illustrated features, the multiple M is sufficiently disclosed in the specification, and no further disclosure is required in the drawings.

Further, applicant respectfully submits that the information of the MPEG-2 TS packets Nu, which is related to the whole multiple K shown in equation (1), is indeed already illustrated in FIG. 2.

Additionally, Tuf and Tdf are illustrated in FIG. 2, and page 9 of the specification explains how the whole multiple relates to the downlink values of Tdf and Ntd in the drawings.

Based on the believed sufficiency of the drawings and written description as explained above, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the drawing objection. Alternatively,

applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide further clarification to applicant as to how the drawing objection can be overcome.

The Examiner also objects to claims 3 and 4 due to an alleged informality. While applicant respectfully disagrees with this objection, in the interest of compact prosecution, applicant has amended claims 3 and 4. If the Examiner does not believe that the present amendments address the objections, then applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact applicant prior to the issuance of the next Office Action, in the interest of expediting the prosecution of this application.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of all objections is respectfully requested.

II. Claims 1-6 are not Anticipated

Claims 1-6 stand rejected due to allege anticipation under 35 USC §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 4,577,316 (Schiff). Applicant respectfully submits that Schiff fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claims 1-6. Thus, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of the claims.

The presently claimed invention is directed to a system and a method for commonly synchronizing bursts transmitted over an uplink connection in an integrated multispot satellite communication system of a multimedia broadcasting network. More specifically, a common synchronization is provided for the interactive services and the broadcast. Further, the presently claimed invention is directed to a multimedia network that is for digital video broadcasting (DVB) applications that permit a user to request broadband interactive services employing standard stations both on the transmission and on the reception side.

Pages 7-9 of the specification disclose details of the signal processing, which are illustrated in FIG. 2, while pages 5-6 of the specification disclose the general system and method of the presently claimed invention. One feature of the presently claimed invention is that the burst synchronization scheme of the DVB-RCS standard can be used by the user and the provider, and the on-board DVB multiplexer can employ synchronous multiplexing, which results in a simplification of the generation of the network clock reference (NCR) and the clock frequency. The foregoing is largely related to the DVB-RCS standard explained at pages 1-3 of the specification.

Schiff discloses a satellite scheme for synchronizing multiple stations using the TDMA standard. However, Schiff does not disclose broadband communication, or the ability to perform multimedia communication. The bandwidth disclosed in Schiff is substantially lower from those that would be required for multimedia communication in view of the DVB-RCS standard disclosed by applicants.

Applicant respectfully submits that Schiff fails to disclose all of the claimed combinations of features. For example, but not by way of limitation, applicant respectfully submits that Schiff fails to disclose a multimedia broadcast network, as recited in independent claims 1 and 5. While the Examiner has explained at page 3 of the Office Action that Schiff discloses this claimed feature at column 2, lines 56-59, applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization. For example, but not by way of limitation, applicant respectfully submits that Schiff fails to disclose the multimedia broadcast network recited in claims 1 and 5.

There is no disclosure that Schiff is configured to be used in a multimedia broadcast network, or can handle the quantity and quality of data at the required communication speed to

be usable in a multimedia broadcast network. For example, but not by way of limitation, while Schiff discloses a transmission rate of 10 megabits per second, the presently claimed invention is directed to the much higher rates of 54, 81 and 108 megabits per second. Applicant respectfully submits that Schiff is not directed to such speeds of operation. Also, as explained in the specification, DVB-RCS is an exemplary standard, and neither this standard nor any other standard is disclosed or suggested in Schiff. Thus, applicant respectfully submits that Schiff fails to disclose a multimedia broadcast network, as recited in independent claims 1 and 5.

Further, applicant respectfully submits that Schiff fails to disclose that the transmission rate is a whole multiple of the clock reference. The Examiner uses applicant's specification to perform a calculation that is unsupported by Schiff. Further, applicant respectfully submits that FIG. 5, which is referred to by the Examiner as disclosing the claimed invention, does not even support synchronization, see col. 5, lines 7-20 of Schiff, which explains why synchronization is not achieved in FIG. 5 of Schiff. Because Schiff alone does not disclose this claimed feature, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations recited in claim 1 are clearly not disclosed, and that the rejection should therefore be withdrawn, and independent claims 1 and 5 allowed.

Claims 2-4 depend from independent claim 1, and claim 6 depends from independent claim 5. Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims are allowable at least due to their dependency from their respective independent claims. Additionally, with respect to dependent claim 4, applicant respectfully submits that the claim limitations are not disclosed by Schiff alone. Further, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's use of applicant's own specification (which is not disclosed to be related art) against applicant in combination with Schiff is improper for a rejection under 35 USC 102.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of the rejected claims.

III. New Claims

As shown above, applicants have added new dependent claims 7-14. Applicant respectfully submits that the new claims are in proper condition for allowance, and thus respectfully requests allowance of all of the pending claims.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account. The necessary extension of time fees are being paid electronically by said Deposit Account, as this amendment is being filed by the Electronic Filing System.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mainak H. Mehta/
Mainak H. Mehta
Registration No. 46,924

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 25, 2006